

REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for granting and participating in the Personal Interview conducted on 12 October 2006 and for her helpful comments and suggestions toward advancing prosecution of the instant application. During the Interview Messrs. Doskow and Hetz provided a summary of the invention including the problems identified by Applicants in providing access to network elements and functions to which the embodiments and implementations of the present invention are directed. Applicants further discussed the requirement that the signaling system security monitor “determine if [the] control data messages are proper ... and properly sequenced.” As explained during the Interview, an aspect of the invention that is not taught or suggested by the applied art, including Schneier (“Applied Cryptography”), is a check of the sequence or temporal relationship of the control messages. As the Examiner takes the position that checking that the control data messages are *properly sequenced* may include a simple time check to verify that a message is not stale or part of a replay attack, for the sole purpose of advancing prosecution and without disclaimer or prejudice to assert otherwise in any continuation application, reexamination, or other proceedings involving such claim language, Applicants agreed to instead characterize this aspect of the invention as determining if the control data messages are *chronologically sequenced*.

Also discussed during the Interview were limitations present in claim 10 that are directed to specific codes used in telephone signaling. While the invention is considered to be broader than the specific codes enumerated by claim 10, the recited codes are exemplary of those envisioned by various embodiments of the invention and, in any case, further distinguish over the applied art. So as to further emphasize the import of each of these codes, each independently further distinguishing the invention over the applied art, the claims have been amended to separately recite the codes, amended claim 10 directed to a destination point code, and new claims 39 and 40 to the originating point code and service indicator, respectively.

Also discussed during the interview was the subject matter of claims 19 through 24 requiring the use of message templates. As mentioned in the Proposed Agenda for Interview filed in advance of the Interview, Hanson’s use of “action message” and “call transfer” templates

is fundamentally different from the claimed message templates. While Hanson uses the same word, i.e., “template” in describing a sequence of steps or rules, i.e., his “action message templates” or his “call transfer templates”, Applicant’s message “templates” are used to validate that a control message is properly formatted and/or is appropriate even view of prior control messages, e.g., is properly sequenced. Accordingly, the “templates” of claims 19 through 24 are patentably distinguishable over that of the applied prior art in view of the definition and interpretation of this term given and supported by Applicant’s disclosure even if the language, when taken out of context, might otherwise bear some similarity.

In connection with the present response, Applicants adopt herein language discussed during the interview by the instant amendments of independent claims 1 and 25 as hereinabove detailed so as to emphasize authentication based on the chronological sequence of control messages. As previously emphasized, these changes to adopt language for which agreement has been reached are made for the sole purpose of advancing prosecution without disclaimer, prejudice or waiver of right to include claims of similar or any other scope supported by the instant disclosure in a continuation application. The claims are also amended to correct minor typographical error identified during review of those claims. Claims 10 is amended and claims 39 and 40 added for the reasons given above. Finally, claim 9 is amended to correct an error in dependency.

In summary, as the present amendment adopts language agreed to during the referenced interview as distinguishing over the applied art and thereby overcoming the outstanding rejection, claims 1 and 25 and claims 2-24 and 26 – 40 dependent therefrom are considered to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application and an early notice of allowance are respectfully requested.

Applicants include payment herewith for the addition of two extra dependent claims and have filed concurrently herewith a Petition for a Two-Month Extension of Time. However, if any other or additional fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 06-2375, under Order

No. 414.038CIP/10007256 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Dated: October 30, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By

Michael J. Strauss

Registration No.: 32,443

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.

801 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, DC 20004-2623

(202) 662-0200

(202) 662-4643 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant